

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the January 11, 2008 Office action. This Amendment C amends claims 1, 9, 23, 31, 45 and 48 to more clearly set forth the invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and following remarks and the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,760,721 to Chasen et al., US Patent No. 5,821,937 to Tonelli, et al. and in view of US Patent No. 7,062,502 to Kesler et al. Applicants submit that the combined references of Chasen, Tonelli and Kesler fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the independent claims 1, 9, 23, 31, 45 and 48 as amended.

As an overview, Applicants respectfully submit that Kesler teaches away from embodiments of the invention. The Office cited col. 12, lines 20-36 of Kesler in rejecting distinguishable features of the rejected claims:

20 Entity and Entity Relationship Permissions

25 Data entry and navigation functionality in the UI are provided through “pop-up” menus. These menus are generated dynamically from metadata stored in the configuration repository. The metadata associated with menus is “pre-defined” in the sense that it is not derived from the database schema but instead built into the UI architecture. As will be demonstrated throughout the remainder of this document, the type of menu shown to a user at any given point is determined by the “menu context”. The menu context simply describes the point from within the UI where the end user requests a menu.

30 As will be shown, menu contexts are tightly coupled to entities and entity relationships. Thus, permissions that provide access to menu options (stored as metadata) are granted at the entity and entity relationship level.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kesler teaches a fundamentally different concept from aspects of the invention by describing that the **menu is dynamically formed, but the options or metadata that is associated with the menu is static or predefined** (emphasis added). In other words, Kesler teaches away from providing dynamic options; Kesler specifically emphasizes that the options are predefined and built-in to the UI architecture. Even though the options are based on the "menu contexts," but such menu contexts are tightly coupled to the entities and entity relationship and not determined dynamically as a function of and depending upon the **determined property category data and the defined property data of the selected media file**. See also paragraph [0035] for an example when a user wishes to correct a misspelling of the genre "Rck" to "Rock."

Advantageously, amended claim 1 recites "providing dynamic options to a user for modifying or supplementing the property data of the selected media file, **said provided dynamic options for modifying or supplementing being displayed** as a function of and depending upon the **determined property category data and the defined property data of the selected media file**." See also at least FIG. 3A and paragraph [0035]. Therefore, depending on the defined property data of the selected media file and the determined property category data, the options vary dynamically. Kesler specifically teaches away from dynamic options because it specifically describes "pre-defined" options. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that, in addition to arguments previously presented, the combined references of Chasen, Tonelli and Kesler fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claim 1. Hence, the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Similarly, amended claim 9 recites, in part, "...associating the selected property category data with different property category data, said associating corresponding to another instruction from the user, said another instruction comprising dragging the selected property category data and dropping the selected property category data to a location on the display of the different property category data, wherein the different property category data defines a different property than the property of the media file; in response to the associating, providing dynamic options to the user for modifying or supplementing the selected property category data of the media file, **said dynamic**

options for modifying or supplementing being provided as a function of and based upon the selected property category data and the different property category data...." For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references of Chasen, Tonelli and Kesler fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 9. Hence, the rejection of claims 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Amended claim 23 recites, in part, "...in response to the associating, displaying instructions for providing dynamic options to the user for modifying or supplementing the property data included in the metadata field of the media file, **said dynamic options for modifying or supplementing being provided as a function of and based upon the defined property of the media file and the property category data...."** Because Kesler fails to cure the deficiencies of Chasen and Tonelli and its own disclosure specifically teaches away from "dynamic options," not "dynamic menus," Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is patentable over the cited reference. Therefore, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claims 23-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claim 31 is amended to recite: "in response to the associating, displaying instructions for providing dynamic options to the user for modifying or supplementing the identified property category data of the media file, **said dynamic options for modifying or supplementing being provided as a function of the identified property category data and the different property category data...."** For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references of Chasen, Tonelli, and Kesler fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 31. Hence, the rejection of claims 31-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Amended claims 45 and 48 recite, "wherein the computer system is responsive to associating the selected media file with property category data by providing dynamic options to a user for modifying or supplementing the property of the selected media file, said dynamic options for modifying or supplementing being provided as a function of and based upon the property of the media file and the property category data..." and "recites, "wherein the computer system is responsive to associating the selected property category data with the different property category data by providing dynamic

options to a user for modifying or supplementing the selected property category data included in the metadata field of the media file, said dynamic options for modifying or supplementing being provided as a function of and based upon the selected property category data and the different property category data..., " respectively. For at least the reasons above, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over the cited art because the combined references of Chasen, Tonelli and Kesler fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claims. Therefore, the rejection of claims 45-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The prior art made of record fails to disclose presenting or providing options to a user for modifying or supplementing the metadata in response to the associating.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 9, 23, 31, 45 and 48 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. The fact that the Applicant may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/TAN-CHI YUAN/

Tan-Chi Yuan, Limited Recognition, No. L0113
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY/eaw

Via EFS